

**REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

Claims 26-45 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 14-25 have been canceled without prejudice and without disclaimer. New claims 26-45 have been added. Support can be found in the specification, for instance, at [0010], [0011], [0043], and [0045] of US2004/0102997 and in Figs. 11 and 13. No new matter has been introduced.

**35 U.S.C. §102 & §103**

Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Motegi et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0076352). Claims 21, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by, or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over, Manabe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,971,913). Claims 22 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manabe in view of Motegi.

**Claims 26-36**

Applicants respectfully submit that new independent claim 26 is novel and patentable over Motegi and Manabe because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest an information transmission unit connected to the information supervisor device through a first communication line and a first automatic analyzer, the information transmission unit transmitting reagent cross-contamination information obtained by a test using the first automatic analyzer to the information supervisor device; and an information receiver unit connected to the information supervisor device through a second communication line and a second automatic analyzer, the

information receiver unit receiving the reagent cross-contamination information stored in the information supervisor device from the information supervisor device; wherein the information supervisor device includes a true or false validating unit to validate whether the reagent cross-contamination information transmitted from the information transmission unit is true or false; and wherein the information supervisor device includes a transmitting mechanism to transmit the reagent cross-contamination information stored in the information supervisor device and judged to be true by the true or false validating unit to the information receiver unit periodically.

The invention as claimed includes (1) an information transmission unit connected to the information supervisor device through a first communication line and a first automatic analyzer, to transmit reagent cross-contamination information obtained by a test using the first automatic analyzer to the information supervisor device; (2) an information receiver unit connected to the information supervisor device through a second communication line and a second automatic analyzer, to receive reagent cross-contamination information stored in the information supervisor device; (3) a true or false validating unit in the information supervisor device to validate whether the reagent cross-contamination information transmitted from the information transmission unit is true or false; and (4) a transmitting mechanism in the information supervisor device to transmit the reagent cross-contamination information stored in the information supervisor device and judged to be true by the true or false validating unit to the information receiver unit periodically. Based on these features, the cross-contamination prevention system can greatly reduce the burden imposed on a customer by the time-consuming test, thereby efficiently

preventing data failure caused by cross-contamination. See [0008] of US2004/0102997.

Manabe discloses that the combination of the reagents influences the analysis result by mixing with each other, generating the reagent cross-contamination. The combination of the reagents is stored in the memory, and the order of reagents to be used to analyze a sample is decided so as not to generate reagent cross-contamination. However, Manabe fails to teach or suggest the four features recited in claim 26.

Motegi discloses that the memory stores the information concerning the judgment as to whether reagent cross-contamination is generated or not at each analysis operation. It is decided whether or not the result of the judgment is the same as that of the previous judgment. If the result disagrees with the previous judgment, it is judged that trouble arises in the mechanism for preventing the generation of reagent cross-section, i.e., cleaning mechanism. While Motegi also discloses storing the information indicating the presence or absence of reagent cross-contamination, it too fails to disclose or suggest the four features recited in claim 26.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 26 and claims 27-36 depending therefrom are novel and patentable over Manabe and Motegi.

Claims 37-45

Applicants respectfully submit that new independent claim 37 is novel and patentable over Motegi and Manabe because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest an information transmission unit connected to the information supervisor device through a first communication line and a first automatic analyzer, the

information transmission unit transmitting reagent cross-contamination information obtained by a test using the first automatic analyzer to the information supervisor device; and an information receiver unit connected to the information supervisor device through a second communication line and a second automatic analyzer, the information receiver unit receiving the reagent cross-contamination information stored in the information supervisor device from the information supervisor device; wherein the information supervisor device includes a true or false validating unit to validate whether the reagent cross-contamination information transmitted from the information transmission unit is true or false; and wherein the information supervisor device includes a transmitting mechanism to transmit only the reagent cross-contamination information stored in the information supervisor device and judged to be true by the true or false validating unit to the information receiver unit.

The invention as claimed includes (1) an information transmission unit connected to the information supervisor device through a first communication line and a first automatic analyzer, to transmit reagent cross-contamination information obtained by a test using the first automatic analyzer to the information supervisor device; (2) an information receiver unit connected to the information supervisor device through a second communication line and a second automatic analyzer, to receive reagent cross-contamination information stored in the information supervisor device; (3) a true or false validating unit in the information supervisor device to validate whether the reagent cross-contamination information transmitted from the information transmission unit is true or false; and (4) a transmitting mechanism in the information supervisor device to transmit only the reagent cross-contamination information stored in the information supervisor device and judged to be true by the

true or false validating unit to the information receiver unit. Based on these features, the cross-contamination prevention system can greatly reduce the burden imposed on a customer by the time-consuming test, thereby efficiently preventing data failure caused by cross-contamination.

Manabe discloses that the combination of the reagents influences the analysis result by mixing with each other, generating the reagent cross-contamination. The combination of the reagents is stored in the memory, and the order of reagents to be used to analyze a sample is decided so as not to generate reagent cross-contamination. However, Manabe fails to teach or suggest the four features recited in claim 37.

Motegi discloses that the memory stores the information concerning the judgment as to whether reagent cross-contamination is generated or not at each analysis operation. It is decided whether or not the result of the judgment is the same as that of the previous judgment. If the result disagrees with the previous judgment, it is judged that trouble arises in the mechanism for preventing the generation of reagent cross-section, i.e., cleaning mechanism. While Motegi also discloses storing the information indicating the presence or absence of reagent cross-contamination, it too fails to disclose or suggest the four features recited in claim 37.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 37 and claims 38-45 depending therefrom are novel and patentable over Manabe and Motegi.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY & MALUR, P.C.

*/Chun-Pok "Roger" Leung/  
Chun-Pok "Roger" Leung  
Reg. No. 41,405  
(703) 684-1120*